

Examples of Asymptotic ℓ_1

Banach spaces

by

S. A. Argyros and I. Deliyanni

Athens – Herakleion, Greece

ABSTRACT

Two examples of asymptotic ℓ_1 Banach spaces are given. The first, X_u , has an unconditional basis and is arbitrarily distortable. The second, X , does not contain any unconditional basic sequence. Both are spaces of the type of Tsirelson. We thus answer a question raised by W.T. Gowers.

Introduction

The first example of an arbitrarily distortable Banach space was constructed by Th. Schlumprecht in [Schl]. Schlumprecht's space was the starting point for the construction by W.T. Gowers and B. Maurey of a Banach space not containing an unconditional basic sequence (u.b.s.) [G-M] and for the examples, due to W.T. Gowers, of a Banach space not containing ℓ_1 , c_0 or a reflexive subspace [G1] and of a space without u.b.s. but with an asymptotically unconditional basis [G2].

A rapid development of the theory of Banach spaces followed the examples of Schlumprecht and Gowers - Maurey. We mention some results.

The notion of a hereditarily indecomposable Banach space was introduced in [G-M] and a new dichotomy property for Banach spaces regarding this notion was proved by Gowers [G3]. The remarkable solution of the distortion problem for ℓ_p , ($1 < p < \infty$) by E. Odell and Th. Schlumprecht also makes

use of Schlumprecht's space. Finally these results led to a new interest in the asymptotic structure of Banach spaces [Mi-To], [Ma-Mi-To].

The examples we give in the present paper have as starting point Tsirelson's celebrated example of the reflexive Banach space T not containing any ℓ_p . We recall, following T. Figiel and W. Johnson [F-J] the definition of Tsirelson's norm. Let $0 < \theta < 1$. On c_{00} (the space of finitely supported sequences) we define implicitly the norm $\|\cdot\|_T$ by

$$\|x\|_T = \max \left\{ \|x\|_\infty, \sup \theta \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\|_T \right\},$$

where the "sup" is taken over all families $\{E_1, E_2, \dots, E_k\}$ of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ such that $n \leq E_1 < E_2 < \dots < E_n$. Tsirelson's space is an asymptotic ℓ_1 space. We recall the definition of this notion, introduced in [Mi-To].

A Banach space with a normalized basis $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is asymptotic ℓ_p if there exists a constant C such that for every n there exists $N = N(n)$ such that every sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ of successive normalized blocks of $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $N < \text{supp } x_1 < \text{supp } x_2 < \dots < \text{supp } x_n$ is C -equivalent to the canonical basis of ℓ_p^n .

We consider the following generalization of Tsirelson's example. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a family of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ closed in the topology of pointwise convergence. A finite sequence $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ is said to be $\mathcal{M}$ -admissible if there exists a set $F = \{k_1, \dots, k_n\} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$k_1 \leq E_1 < k_2 \leq E_2 < \dots < k_n \leq E_n.$$

Let $0 < \theta < 1$. The Tsirelson type Banach space $T[\mathcal{M}, \theta]$ is the completion of c_{00} under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{M}, \theta}$ which is defined by the following implicit equation:

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{M}, \theta} = \max \left\{ \|x\|_\infty, \sup \theta \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\|_{\mathcal{M}, \theta} \right\},$$

where the "sup" is taken over all n and all $\mathcal{M}$ -admissible sequences $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^n$. It is clear that Tsirelson's original space is $T[\mathcal{S}, \theta]$ where $\mathcal{S}$ is the Schreier family defined by

$$\mathcal{S} = \{F : F \subset \mathbf{N}, \#F \leq \min F\}.$$

Consider $A_n = \{F : F \subset \mathbf{N}, \#F \leq n\}$. S. Bellenot, [B], has proved the following result: For every $1 < p < \infty$ and $n \geq 2$ there exists $0 < \theta < 1$

such that $T[A_n, \theta]$ is isomorphic to ℓ_p . The spaces $T[\mathcal{F}_\xi, \theta]$ (the families $\mathcal{F}_\xi$, $\xi < \omega_1$ are defined below) were introduced by the first author in order to prove the following result: For every $\xi < \omega_1$ there exists a reflexive Banach space T_ξ such that every infinite dimensional subspace of T_ξ has Szlenk index greater than ξ (preprint, 1987). The general spaces $T[\mathcal{M}, \theta]$ were defined in [Ar-D].

The examples we present here are defined using “mixed Tsirelson’s norms”. These norms are defined by sequences $\{\mathcal{M}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that each $\mathcal{M}_n$ is a family of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ closed in the topology of pointwise convergence and $0 < \theta_n < 1$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n = 0$. The norm in the space $T[(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n=1}^\infty]$ is defined by

$$\|x\| = \max \left\{ \|x\|_\infty, \sup_k \left\{ \theta_k \sup \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\| \right\} \right\},$$

where the inner ‘sup’ is taken over all n and all $\mathcal{M}_k$ -admissible families $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$. It is easy to see that if the Schreier family $\mathcal{S}$ is contained in one of the families $\mathcal{M}_n$ then the space $T[(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n=0}^\infty]$ is asymptotic- ℓ^1 . Our first space, X_u , is a space of the form $T[(\mathcal{M}_n, \theta_n)_{n=0}^\infty]$ for appropriate sequences $(\mathcal{M}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(\theta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. X_u has an unconditional basis and is arbitrarily distortable. The second space, X , does not contain any unconditional basic sequence. In fact it is hereditarily indecomposable. X is constructed via X_u in a way similar to the one used in [G-M] to pass from Schlumprecht’s space to the Gowers-Maurey space. The basic idea for this comes from the fundamental construction by Maurey and Rosenthal [M-R] of a weakly null sequence without unconditional basic subsequence.

Although our approach is different from that of Schlumprecht, Gowers and Maurey, it seems that the ingredients needed for the proofs are similar. So, for example, the normalized (ϵ, j) -special convex combinations correspond to ℓ_N^1 vectors and the rapidly increasing (ϵ, j) -s.c.c.’s correspond to sums of rapidly increasing sequences.

1 Preliminaries

(a) Generalized Schreier families

The *Schreier family* $\mathcal{S}$ is the set of all finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ satisfying the property $\#A \leq \min A$. It is easy to see that this family is closed in the topology of pointwise convergence.

1.1 Definition. Given $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$, families of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ which are closed in the topology of pointwise convergence, the $\mathcal{M}$ operation on $\mathcal{N}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}] = \left\{ F \subset \mathbf{N} : F = \bigcup_{i=1}^s F_i, \quad s \in \mathbf{N}, \quad m_1 \leq F_1 < m_2 \leq F_2 < \cdots < m_s \leq F_s \right. \\ \left. F_i \in \mathcal{N}, i = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } \{m_1, \dots, m_s\} \in \mathcal{M} \right\}.$$

$\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{N}]$ is a family of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ which is closed in the topology of pointwise convergence.

1.2 Definition. The generalized Schreier families $\{\mathcal{F}_\xi\}_{\xi < \omega_1}$ are defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\{n\} : n \in \mathbf{N}\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\xi+1} = \mathcal{S}[\mathcal{F}_\xi].$$

For ξ a limit ordinal we let $\{\xi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a fixed sequence strictly increasing to ξ and set

$$\mathcal{F}_\xi = \{A \subset \mathbf{N} : n \leq \min A \text{ and } A \in \mathcal{F}_{\xi_n}\}.$$

The families $\{\mathcal{F}_\xi\}_{\xi < \omega_1}$ have been introduced in [Al-Ar].

Remark. It is easy to see that for ξ_1, ξ_2 there exist $\xi < \omega_1$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\xi_1}[\mathcal{F}_{\xi_2}] \subset \mathcal{F}_\xi$. In particular, for $m, n \in \mathbf{N}$, $\mathcal{F}_n[\mathcal{F}_m] = \mathcal{F}_{n+m}$.

(b) Tsirelson type spaces

In [Ar-D] a space $T[\mathcal{M}, \theta]$ has been defined, where $\mathcal{M}$ is a family of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ closed in the topology of pointwise convergence and θ a real number with $0 < \theta < 1$.

We recall that definition. Given $\mathcal{M}$ as above, a family $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$ of successive finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ is said to be $\mathcal{M}$ -admissible if there exists a set $A = \{m_1, \dots, m_n\} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $m_1 \leq E_1 < m_2 \leq E_2 < \dots < m_n \leq E_n$. The norm on the space $T[\mathcal{M}, \theta]$ is defined implicitly by the formula $\|x\| = \max\{\|x\|_\infty, \theta \sup \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\|\}$, where the ‘sup’ is taken over all n and all $\mathcal{M}$ -admissible $(E_1, \dots, E_n)$.

It is known that if the Cantor-Bendixson index of $\mathcal{M}$ is greater than ω , then the space $T[\mathcal{M}, \theta]$ is reflexive. In 1.3 we prove a somewhat more general result.

(c) Mixed Tsirelson norms

Let $\{\mathcal{M}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be families of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ such that for each k :

- (a) $\mathcal{M}_k$ is closed in the topology of pointwise convergence.
- (b) $\mathcal{M}_k$ is adequate, i.e. if $A \in \mathcal{M}$ and $B \subset A$ then $B \in \mathcal{M}_k$.
- (c) The Cantor - Bendixson index of $\mathcal{M}_k$ is greater than ω .

Let $\{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of positive reals with each $\theta_k < 1$ and $\lim \theta_k = 0$. Then the mixed Tsirelson norm defined by $(\mathcal{M}_k, \theta_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ is given by the implicit relation

$$\|x\| = \max \left\{ \|x\|_\infty, \sup_k \left\{ \theta_k \sup \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\| \right\} \right\},$$

where the inside “sup” is taken over all $\mathcal{M}_k$ -admissible families $E_1, \dots, E_n$.

The Banach space defined by this norm is denoted by $T[(\mathcal{M}_k, \theta_k)_{k=1}^\infty]$.

1.3 Proposition. The space $X = T[(\mathcal{M}_k, \theta_k)_{k=1}^\infty]$ is reflexive and $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is an 1-unconditional basis for X .

Proof. The proof is similar to the original proof of Tsirelson in [T]. We first give an alternative definition of the norm of X .

We define inductively the following sets:

$$K^0 = \{\lambda e_n : n \in \mathbf{N}, |\lambda| \leq 1\}.$$

Given K^s ,

$K^{s+1} = K^s \cup \left\{ \theta_k(f_1 + \dots + f_d) : k \in \mathbf{N}, d \in \mathbf{N}, f_i \in K^s, i = 1, \dots, d, \right.$
 $\left. \text{supp } f_1 < \text{supp } f_2 < \dots < \text{supp } f_d \text{ and the set } \{\text{supp } f_1, \dots, \text{supp } f_d\} \text{ is } \mathcal{M}_k\text{-admissible} \right\}.$

Finally, we set

$$K = \bigcup_{s=0}^{\infty} K^s$$

and for $x \in c_{00}$ we define

$$\|x\| = \sup_{f \in K} \langle x, f \rangle.$$

Then X is the completion of $(c_{00}, \|\cdot\|)$. It is easy to see that $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a 1-unconditional basis for X .

To show that X is reflexive, we have to show that the basis $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is shrinking and boundedly complete.

(a) $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a shrinking basis for X .

Let $\theta = \max_k \theta_k < 1$. For $f \in X^*$ and $m \in \mathbf{N}$, denote by $Q_m(f)$ the restriction of f to the space generated by $\{e_k\}_{k \geq m}$. It suffices to prove the following: For every $f \in B_{X^*}$ there is $m \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $Q_m(f) \in \theta B_{X^*}$. Recall that $B_{X^*} = \overline{\text{co}(K)}$ where the closure is in the topology of pointwise convergence. We shall first prove the following:

Claim. For every $f \in \overline{K}$ there is m such that $Q_m(f) \in \theta \overline{K}$.

So, let $f \in \overline{K}$ and let $\{f^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in K converging pointwise to f .

If $f^n \in K^0$ for an infinite number of n , we have nothing to prove. So suppose that for every n there are $k_n \in \mathbf{N}$, a set $\{m_1^n, \dots, m_{d_n}^n\} \in \mathcal{M}_{k_n}$ and vectors $f_i \in K$, $i = 1, \dots, d_n$ such that $m_1^n \leq \text{supp } f_1^n < m_2^n \leq \text{supp } f_2^n < \dots < m_{d_n}^n \leq \text{supp } f_{d_n}^n$. If there is a subsequence of θ_{k_n} converging to 0, then $f = 0$. So we may suppose that there is a k such that $k_n = k$ for all n , i.e. $\theta_{k_n} = \theta_k$ and $\{m_1^n, \dots, m_k^n\} \in \mathcal{M}_k$.

Since $\mathcal{M}_k$ is compact, substituting f^n with a subsequence we get that there is a set $\{m_1, \dots, m_d\} \in \mathcal{M}_k$ such that the sequence of indicator functions of the sets $\{m_1^n, \dots, m_{d_n}^n\}$ converges to the indicator function of $\{m_1, \dots, m_d\}$. So, for large n , $m_i^n = m_i$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, and $m_{d+1}^n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Passing to a further subsequence of $(f^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, we get that there exist $f_i \in \overline{K}$, $i = 1, \dots, d$ with $\text{supp } f_i \subset [m_i, m_{i+1})$, $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ and $\text{supp } f_d \subset$

$[m_d, \infty)$ such that $f_j^n \rightarrow f_j$ pointwise for $j = 1, \dots, d$. We conclude that $f = \theta_k(f_1 + \dots + f_d)$, so $Q_{m_d}(f) = \theta_k f_d \in \overline{\theta K}$.

The proof of the claim is complete. In particular we get that $\overline{K}$ is a weakly compact subset of c_0 .

By standard arguments we can now pass to the case of $B_{X^*} = \overline{co(K)}$.

(b) $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a boundedly complete basis for X .

Suppose on the contrary that there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a block sequence $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\|\sum_{i=1}^\infty x_i\| \leq 1$ while $\|x_i\| \geq \epsilon$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$.

Choose $n_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $n_0\theta_1 > \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Using the fact that the $n_0 + 1$ -derivative set of $\mathcal{M}_1$ is non-empty, one can choose a set $\{m_1, \dots, m_{n_0}\} \in \mathcal{M}_1$ and a subset $\{x_{i_k}\}_{k=1}^{n_0}$ of $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that

$$m_1 \leq \text{supp } x_{i_1} < m_2 \leq \text{supp } x_{i_2} < \dots < m_{n_0} \leq \text{supp } x_{i_{n_0}}.$$

Then

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{n_0} x_{i_k} \right\| \geq \theta_1 \sum_{k=1}^{n_0} \|x_{i_k}\| \geq n_0\theta_1 > 1,$$

a contradiction and the proof is complete.

(d) Special convex combinations

Next we prove a property of $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ which is important for our constructions.

1.4 Proposition. For every $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $m > n$ such that for every infinite subset D of $\mathbf{N}$ there exists a convex combination $x = \sum_{n=1}^s a_n e_{k_n}$ with $\text{supp } x \subset D$, $\text{supp } x \in \mathcal{F}_m$, $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^s$ is in decreasing order and $|x|_n < \epsilon$, where $|\cdot|_n$ denotes the norm of the space $T\left[\mathcal{F}_n, \frac{1}{2}\right]$.

We prove first the following

1.5 Lemma. For every $n \geq 2$, $\epsilon > 0$, D infinite subset of $\mathbf{N}$, there exists a convex combination $x = \sum_{n=1}^s a_n e_{k_n}$ such that

- (i) $\text{supp } x \subset D$, $\text{supp } x \in \mathcal{F}_n$
- (ii) $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^s$ is in decreasing order
- (iii) For every F in $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ we have that $\sum_{n \in F} a_n < \epsilon$.

Proof. We prove it for $n = 2$. The general case is proved by induction in a similar manner.

Choose n_0 such that $\frac{1}{n_0} < \epsilon^2$, $n_0 \in D$. Set $A_1 = \{n_0\}$ and choose A_2 in $\mathcal{F}_1$ such that $A_2 \subset D$, $A_1 < A_2$, $\#A_2 \geq \frac{n_0}{\epsilon^2}$. Similarly choose $A_3, \dots, A_{n_0}$. It is easy to check that the convex combination

$$\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{l=1}^{n_0} \frac{1}{\#A_l} \cdot \chi_{A_l}$$

is the desired vector. The proof is complete.

Proof of Proposition. Choose l such that $\frac{1}{2^l} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and m such that $\mathcal{F}_n[\dots[\mathcal{F}_n]\dots]$ (l -times) is contained in $\mathcal{F}_{m-1}$.

Next choose, by the previous lemma, a convex combination satisfying (i), (ii) and (iii) for the given D and $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$. We claim that this is the desired vector.

Indeed, choose any ϕ in the norming set K , as it is defined in the proof of Proposition 1.3 for the space $T[\mathcal{F}_n, \frac{1}{2}]$. Notice that the set $L = \{k \in \mathbf{N}_r : |\phi(x)| \geq \frac{1}{2^l}\}$ is in $\mathcal{F}_{m-1}$. To see this one proves that $\phi|L$ belongs to K^l and for every ϕ' in K^l , $\text{supp } \phi'$ is in $\mathcal{F}_n[\dots[\mathcal{F}_n]\dots]$ (l -times), hence indeed $\text{supp } (\phi|L)$ is in $\mathcal{F}_{m-1}$. Therefore

$$|\phi(x)| \leq |(\phi|L)(x)| + |(\phi|L^c)(x)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon.$$

The proof is complete.

2 Definition of the space X_u

Choose $\{m_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ such that $m_0 = 2$, and $m_j > m_{j-1}^{m_{j-1}}$. Inductively we choose a family $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ such that each $\mathcal{M}_j$ is a family of finite subsets of $\mathbf{N}$ closed in the topology of pointwise convergence.

We set $\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{F}_1$.

Suppose that $\{\mathcal{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ has been constructed so that it is increasing and for every j there exists k_j such that $\mathcal{M}_j \subset \mathcal{F}_{k_j} \subset \mathcal{M}_{j+1}$. Choose s_{n+1} such that for $\epsilon_{n+1} = \frac{1}{m_{n+2}^4}$, $\mathcal{F}_{s_{n+1}}$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 1.4 for $\mathcal{F}_{k_n}$, ϵ_{n+1} . Choose l_{n+1} such that $\frac{1}{2^{l_{n+1}}} < \frac{1}{2m_{n+1}}$ and set

$$\mathcal{M}_{n+1} = \mathcal{F}_{s_{n+1}}[\dots[\mathcal{F}_{s_{n+1}}]\dots], \quad l_{n+1} \text{ times.}$$

The space

$$X_u = T \left[\left(\mathcal{M}_j, \frac{1}{m_j} \right)_{j=0}^\infty \right]$$

is a reflexive Banach space with an unconditional basis.

For later use we need an explicit definition of the family of functionals that define the norm on the space X_u .

We set $K_j^0 = \{\pm e_n : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$.

Assume that $\{K_i^n\}_{i=0}^\infty$ have been defined. Then we set

$$\begin{aligned} K^n &= \bigcup_{i=0}^\infty K_i^n \\ K_j^{n+1} &= K_j^n \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{m_j} (f_1 + \cdots + f_d) : \{\text{supp } f_1 < \cdots < \text{supp } f_d\} \text{ is} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathcal{M}_j\text{-admissible and } f_1, \dots, f_d \text{ belong to } K^n \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $K = \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty K^n$. Then the norm $\|\cdot\|$ on X_u is

$$\|x\| = \sup \{f(x) : f \in K\}.$$

Notation For $j = 0, 1, \dots$ we denote by K_j the set

$$K_j = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty K_j^n.$$

We will need the following property of the families $\mathcal{M}_n$ which can be easily proved by induction:

2.1 Lemma. Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $F = \{s_1 < s_2 < \cdots < s_d\} \subset \mathbf{N}$ with $F \in \mathcal{M}_n$. If $G = \{t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_r\}$ is such that $r \leq d$ and $s_p \leq t_p$ for $p = 1, 2, \dots, r$, then $G \in \mathcal{M}_n$.

2.2 Notation. We denote by $\|\cdot\|_j$ the norm of the space $T \left[\left(\mathcal{M}_n, \frac{1}{m_n} \right)_{n=0}^j \right]$ and by $\|\cdot\|_j^*$ the corresponding dual norm. Notice that since $\mathcal{M}_j$ is a subfamily of $\mathcal{F}_{k_j}$, $\|x\|_j \leq |x|_{k_j}$ where $|\cdot|_{k_j}$ is the norm of $T \left[\mathcal{F}_{k_j}, \frac{1}{2} \right]$.

2.3 Definition. Let $m \in \mathbf{N}$, $\phi \in K^m \setminus K^{m-1}$. We call *analysis* of ϕ any sequence $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ of subsets of K such that:

- 1) For every s , $K^s(\phi)$ consists of successive elements of K^s and $\cup_{f \in K^s(\phi)} \text{supp } f = \text{supp } \phi$.
- 2) If f belongs to $K^{s+1}(\phi)$ then either $f \in K^s(\phi)$ or there exists j and $f_1, \dots, f_d \in K^s(\phi)$ with $\{\text{supp } f_1 < \dots < \text{supp } f_d\}$ $\mathcal{M}_j$ -admissible and such that $f = \frac{1}{m_j}(f_1 + \dots + f_d)$.
- 3) $K^m(\phi) = \{\phi\}$.

Remark. Every $\phi \in K$ has an analysis. Also, if $f_1 \in F^s(\phi)$, $f_2 \in F^{s+1}(\phi)$, then either $\text{supp } f_1 \subset \text{supp } f_2$ or $\text{supp } f_1 \cap \text{supp } f_2 = \emptyset$

2.4 Definition. (a) Given $\phi \in K^m \setminus K^{m-1}$ and $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ a fixed analysis of ϕ , then for a given finite block sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^l$ we set

$$s_k = \begin{cases} \max\{s : 0 \leq s < m \text{ and there are at least two } f_1, f_2 \in F^s(\phi) \text{ such} \\ \quad \text{that } \text{supp } f_i \cap \text{supp } x_k \neq \emptyset, i = 1, 2\} \\ 0 \text{ if } \#\text{supp } x_k \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

(b) For $k = 1, \dots, l$, we define the *initial* and *final part* of x_k with respect to $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$, denoted by x'_k and x''_k respectively, as follows: Let $\{f \in F^{s_k}(\phi) : \text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } x_k \neq \emptyset\} = \{f_1, \dots, f_d\}$, where $\text{supp } f_1 < \dots < \text{supp } f_d$. Then we set $x'_k = x_k|_{\text{supp } f_1}$, $x''_k = x_k|_{\cup_{i=2}^d \text{supp } f_i}$.

A. Estimates on the basis $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$

2.5 Definition. Given $\epsilon > 0$, an (ϵ, j) -*basic special convex combination* ((ϵ, j) -s.c.c.) is an element of the form $\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k$ such that $F \in \mathcal{M}_j$, $a_k \geq 0$, $\sum_{k \in F} a_k = 1$ and $\|\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k\|_{j-1} < \epsilon$.

Remark. Proposition 1.4 and the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$ guarantee the existence of (ϵ, j) -basic s.c.c.'s for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{m_{j+1}^4}$ and with the additional property that the coefficient $(a_k)_{k \in F}$ are in decreasing order.

So, when referring to an (ϵ, j) -basic s.c.c. $\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k$ we will always mean that the a_k 's are in decreasing order.

2.6 Proposition. For given $j \in \mathbf{N}$, $\epsilon < \frac{1}{m_j^3}$ and $\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k$ an (ϵ, j) -s.c.c. we have that: For $\phi \in K$

$$\left| \phi \left(\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k \right) \right| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{m_s} & \text{if } \phi \in K_s, s \geq j \\ \frac{2}{m_s \cdot m_j} & \text{if } \phi \in K_s, s < j. \end{cases}$$

Proof: If $s \geq j$ then the estimate is obvious.

Assume that $s < j$ and for some $\phi \in K_s$, $|\phi(\sum a_k e_k)| > \frac{2}{m_s m_j}$. Without loss of generality we assume that $\phi(e_k) \geq 0$ for all k . Then $\phi = \frac{1}{m_s}(x_1^* + \dots + x_d^*)$, where $\{\text{supp } x_1^* < \dots < \text{supp } x_d^*\}$ is $\mathcal{M}_s$ -admissible. We set

$$D = \left\{ k \in F : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^*(e_k) > \frac{1}{m_j} \right\}.$$

Then $\sum_{k \in D} a_k > \frac{1}{m_j}$. If not, then

$(\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^*)(\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k) \leq (\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^*)(\sum_{k \in D} a_k e_k) + (\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^*)(\sum_{k \notin D} a_k e_k) \leq \frac{2}{m_j}$, hence $\phi(\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k) \leq \frac{2}{m_s m_j}$, a contradiction. Set $y_i^* = x_i^*|_D$. Then it is easy to see that $\left\| \frac{1}{m_s}(y_1^* + \dots + y_d^*) \right\|_{j-1}^* \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{m_s}(y_1^* + \dots + y_d^*)(\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k) \geq \frac{1}{m_s m_j^2} > \frac{1}{m_j^3}$, a contradiction and the proof is complete.

2.7 Remark. (a) It is easy to see that every (ϵ, j) -s.c.c. in X_u has norm greater than or equal to $\frac{1}{m_j}$. Therefore, for $\epsilon < \frac{1}{m_j^3}$, we get that the norm of the (ϵ, j) -basic s.c.c. is exactly $\frac{1}{m_j}$.

(b) It is crucial for the rest of the proof that for $s < j$, and $x_i^* \in K$, $i = 1, \dots, d$ with $\{\text{supp } x_i^*\}_{i=1}^d$ $\mathcal{M}_s$ -admissible,

$$\left| \frac{1}{m_s}(x_1^* + \dots + x_d^*) \right| \left(\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k \right) \leq \frac{2}{m_s m_j}.$$

In other words, for the normalized vector $m_j \sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k$ we have that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^* \right| \left(\left(m_j \left(\sum_{k \in F} a_k e_k \right) \right) \right) \leq 2.$$

B. Estimates on block sequences

2.8 Definition. (a) Given a normalized block sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$ in X_u , a convex combination $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_{k_i}$ is said to be an (ϵ, j) -s.c.c. if there exist $l_1 < l_2 < \dots < l_n$ such that $\text{supp } x_{k_1} \leq l_1 < \text{supp } x_{k_2} \leq l_2 < \dots < \text{supp } x_{k_n} \leq l_n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_{l_i}$ is an (ϵ, j) -basic s.c.c.

(b) An (ϵ, j) -s.c.c. is called *normalized* if $\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_{k_i}\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

2.9 Lemma. Let $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a normalized block sequence in X_u and $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, $\epsilon > 0$, then there exists $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^n$ a finite block sequence of $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $\|y_k\| = 1$ and a convex combination $\sum a_k y_k$ is an (ϵ, j) -s.c.c. with $\|\sum a_k y_k\| > \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Choose $\{y_k^1\}_{k=1}^\infty$ successive blocks of $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that each y_k^1 is an (ϵ, j) -s.c.c. of $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ defined by an (ϵ, j) -basic s.c.c. z_k^1 such that $\text{supp } z_k^1 \in \mathcal{F}_{s_j}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. If for some k_0 , $\|y_{k_0}^1\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ then we are done; if not we consider the normalized block sequence $x_k^1 = \frac{y_k^1}{\|y_k^1\|}$ and apply the same procedure for $\{x_k^1\}_{k=1}^\infty$ as we did for $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$. So we get $\{y_k^2\}_{k=1}^\infty$, a sequence of (ϵ, j) -s.c.c.'s such that each y_k^2 is defined by a basic s.c.c. z_k^2 with $\text{supp } z_k^2 \in \mathcal{F}_{s_j}$. If $\|y_{k_0}^2\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ then $\{\text{supp } x_k : \text{supp } x_k \subset \text{supp } y_{k_0}^2\}$ is $\mathcal{S}[\mathcal{F}_{s_j}[\mathcal{F}_{s_j}]]$ -admissible (so $\mathcal{M}_j$ -admissible), we get that $\frac{1}{m_j} \leq \|\frac{1}{2} y_{k_0}^2\| < \frac{1}{2^2}$.

Repeating the procedure l_j times, if we never get a y_k^i , $1 \leq i \leq l_j$, with $\|y_k^i\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then we arrive at a $y_{k_0}^{l_j}$ such that $\{\text{supp } x_k : \text{supp } x_k \subset \text{supp } y_{k_0}^{l_j}\}$ is $\mathcal{S}[\mathcal{M}_j]$ -admissible and

$$\frac{1}{2m_j} \leq \frac{1}{2^{l_j-1}} \|y_{k_0}^{l_j}\| < \frac{1}{2^{l_j}},$$

a contradiction since $2m_j < 2^{l_j}$ and the proof is complete.

The way of proving the above result is similar to the one of Gowers and Maurey [G-M] on the existence of ℓ_N^1 -vectors.

2.10 Proposition. Let $j \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^n$ be a finite block sequence of normalized vectors in X_u . Let $\{l_1, \dots, l_n\}$ be such that $\text{supp } x_{k_1} \leq l_1 < \text{supp } x_{k_2} \leq l_2 < \dots < \text{supp } x_{k_n} \leq l_n$ and suppose that $\{l_1, \dots, l_n\} \in \mathcal{M}_j$. Then, for every $q \leq j$ and every $\phi \in K_q$, there exists $\psi \in co(K_q)$ such that $|\phi(x_k)| \leq 2\psi(m_j e_{l_k})$, $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. Let $q \leq j$ and $\phi \in K_q$. Assume that $\phi \in K^m \setminus K^{m-1}$ for some

$m \geq 0$ and let $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ be an analysis of ϕ . Let x'_k, x''_k be the initial and final part of x_k with respect to $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$.

We shall define $\psi', \psi'' \in K_q$ such that for each k , $|\phi(x'_k)| \leq \psi'(m_j e_{l_k})$ and $|\phi(x''_k)| \leq \psi''(m_j e_{l_k})$.

Construction of ψ' .

For $f \in \cup_{s=0}^m K^s(\phi)$, we set

$$D_f = \{k : \text{supp } \phi \cap \text{supp } x'_k = \text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } x'_k\}.$$

By induction on $s = 0, \dots, m$, we shall define for every $f \in \cup_{s=0}^m K^s(\phi)$ a function g_f with the following properties:

- (a) g_f is supported on $\{l_k : k \in D_f\}$.
- (b) For $k \in D_f$, $|f(x'_k)| \leq m_j g_f(e_{l_k})$
- (c) $g_f \in K$. Moreover, if $q \leq j$ and $f \in K_q$, then $g_f \in K_q$.

For $s = 0$, $f = \pm e_m^* \in K^0(\phi)$, $D_f \neq \emptyset$ only if for some k , $l_k = m$ and $x_k = e_{l_k}$. We then set $g_f = e_{l_k}^*$.

Let $s > 0$. Suppose that g_f have been defined for all $f \in \cup_{t=0}^{s-1} K^t(\phi)$. Let $f = \frac{1}{m_q}(f_1 + \dots + f_d) \in K^s(\phi) \setminus K^{s-1}(\phi)$, where $f_i \in K^{s-1}(\phi)$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, and $\{\text{supp } f_1 < \dots < \text{supp } f_d\}$ is $\mathcal{M}_q$ -admissible. Let $I = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq d, D_{f_i} \neq \emptyset\}$. Let $T = D_f \setminus \cup_{i \in I} D_{f_i}$.

Suppose first that $q \leq j$. We set

$$g_f = \frac{1}{m_q} \left(\sum_{i \in I} g_{f_i} + \sum_{k \in T} e_{l_k}^* \right).$$

Property (a) is obvious. For (b) we have:

If $k \in D_{f_i}$ for some $i \in I$,

$$|f(x'_k)| = \frac{1}{m_q} |f_i(x'_k)| \leq \frac{1}{m_q} g_{f_i}(m_j e_{l_k}) = g_f(m_j e_{l_k}),$$

using the inductive hypothesis.

For $k \in T$ we get

$$|f(x'_k)| = \frac{1}{m_q} \left| \sum f'_i(x_k) \right| \leq 1 \leq \frac{m_j}{m_q} = \frac{1}{m_q} e_{l_k}^*(m_j e_{l_k}) = g_f(m_j e_{l_k}).$$

To show that $g_f \in K_q$, we need to show that the set $\{\text{supp } g_{f_i} : i \in I\} \cup \{\{l_k\} : k \in T\}$ is $\mathcal{M}_q$ -admissible.

Let $G = \{t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_r\}$ be an ordering of the set $\{l_k : k \in T\} \cup \{\min\{l_k : k \in D_{f_i}\}, i \in I\}$. Let $F = \{s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_d\} \in \mathcal{M}_j$ be such that $s_1 \leq \text{supp } f_1 < s_2 \leq \text{supp } f_2 < \dots < s_d \leq \text{supp } f_d$. By the definition of x'_k , if $k \in T$ there is $f_i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus I$ such that $\text{supp } f_i \cap \text{supp } x'_k \neq \emptyset$, $\text{supp } f_i \cap \text{supp } x'_m = \emptyset$ for all $m \neq k$. This shows that $r \leq d$ and $s_p \leq t_p$ for all $p \leq r$. Then by Lemma 2.1, $G \in \mathcal{M}_q$.

Suppose now that $q > j$. Then we set $g_f = \frac{1}{m_j} \left(\sum_{i \in I} g_{f_i} + \sum_{k \in T} e_{l_k}^* \right)$. Since $\{l_r, \dots, l_k\} \in \mathcal{M}_j$, it is obvious that $g_f \in K$.

Properties (a) and (b) are also easily checked.

The construction of ψ'' is similar.

Finally, we set $\psi = \frac{1}{2}(\psi' + \psi'')$.

2.11 Corollary. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{m_j^3}$. Let $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k$ be an (ϵ, j) -s.c.c. Then, for $q < j$, $\phi \in K^q$, $|\phi(\sum a_k x_k)| \leq \frac{4}{m_q}$.

Proof. Combine Propositions 2.5 and 2.10.

2.12 Definition. For $j = 1, 2, \dots$, $\epsilon > 0$, a finite block sequence $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^n$ is said to be an (ϵ, j) -rapidly increasing sequence if the following are satisfied:

- (a) There exist $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^n$ with $a_k \geq 0$, $\sum a_k = 1$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k$ is an (ϵ, j) -s.c.c.
- (b) There exist $j_1, \dots, j_n$ such that:
 - (i) $j + 2 < 2j_1 < \dots < 2j_n$,
 - (ii) each y_k is a normalized $\left(\frac{1}{m_{2j_k}^4}, 2j_k\right)$ -s.c.c.
 - (iii) the ℓ^1 -norm of y_k is dominated by $\frac{m_{2j_k+1}}{m_{2j_k+1}-1}$.

The convex combination $y = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k$, where $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^n$ is as above, is said to be an (ϵ, j) -rapidly increasing s.c.c.

2.13 Proposition. Let $j \geq 1$. Let $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^n$ be an (ϵ, j) -rapidly increasing sequence and $(l_i)_{i=1}^n$ be such that $\text{supp } y_1 \leq l_1 < \text{supp } y_2 \leq l_2 < \dots \leq l_{n-1} <$

$\text{supp } y_n \leq l_n$ and $\{l_1, \dots, l_n\} \in \mathcal{M}_j$. Let j_k be as in Definition 2.12. Then, for every $\phi \in K_r$ there exists $\psi \in \text{co}(K)$, such that for $k = 1, \dots, n$,
 $|\phi(y_k)| \leq 8\psi(e_{l_k})$. Moreover,
if $r < 2j_1$ or $r > 2j_n$ then $\psi \in \text{co}K_r$,
if $2j_1 \leq r \leq 2j_n$ then ψ is of the form $\psi = \frac{1}{2}\psi_1 + \frac{1}{2}|\phi(y_k)|e_{l_k}$, where $\psi_1 \in \text{co}(K_{r-1})$.

Proof. The construction is similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 2.10.

Let $\phi \in K_r$. Assume that $\phi \in K^m \setminus K^{m-1}$ and let $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ be an analysis of ϕ . Let y'_k and y''_k be the initial and final part of y_k with respect to $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$.

We shall define ψ' and ψ'' so that $|\phi(y'_k)| \leq 4\psi'(e_{l_k})$ and $|\phi(y''_k)| \leq 4\psi''(e_{l_k})$.

Construction of ψ'

For $f \in \cup_{s=0}^m K^s(\phi)$, we set

$$D_f = \{k : \text{supp } \phi \cap \text{supp } y'_k = \text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } y'_k\}.$$

By induction on $s = 0, \dots, m$, we shall define for every $f \in \cup_{s=0}^m K^s(\phi)$ a function g_f with the following properties:

- a) g_f is supported on $\{e_{l_k} : k \in D_f\}$
- b) $|f(y'_k)| \leq 4g_f(e_{l_k})$ for $k \in D_f$.
- c) $g_f \in K$. Moreover, $g_f \in K_q$, if $q < 2j_1$.

$$g_f = \frac{1}{2}\psi_1 + \frac{1}{2}e_{l_k}, \text{ with } \psi_1 \in K_{s-1}, l_k \notin \text{supp } \psi_2.$$

Let $s > 0$. Suppose that g_f have been defined for all $f \in \cup_{t=0}^{s-1} K^t(\phi)$. Let $f = \frac{1}{m_q}(f_1 + \dots + f_d) \in K^s(\phi) \setminus K^{s-1}(\phi)$,

CASE 1. $q < 2j_1$.

Let $I = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq d, D_{f_i} \neq \emptyset\}$ and $T = D_f \setminus \cup_{i \in I} D_{f_i}$. We set

$$g_f = \frac{1}{m_q} \left(\sum_{i \in I} g_{f_i} + \sum_{k \in T} e_{l_k}^* \right).$$

Properties (a) and (b) for the case $k \in \cup_{i \in I} D_{f_i}$ follow easily from the inductive assumption. For $k \in T$ we get

$$|f(y_k)| = \frac{1}{m_q} \left| \sum f_i(y_k) \right| \leq \frac{4}{m_q} \leq 4g_f(e_{l_k}),$$

by Corollary 2.11, since $q < 2j_k$ for all k .

The proof that $g_f \in K_q$ is as in the proof of Proposition 2.10 (Case $q < j$).

CASE 2. $q \geq 2j_1$.

Let $1 \leq t \leq n$ be such that $2j_t \leq q < 2j_{t+1}$. We shall define g'_f, g''_f, g'''_f supported on $\{l_k : k \leq t-1\}$, $\{l_t\}$ and $\{l_k : k \geq t+1\}$ respectively. Let

$$f' = f|_{\bigcup_{k=1}^{t-1} \text{supp } y'_k}, \quad f'' = f|_{\text{supp } y'_t}, \quad f''' = f|_{\bigcup_{k=t+1}^n \text{supp } y'_k}.$$

Let

$$I' = \left\{ i : 1 \leq i \leq d, \{k \leq t-1\} \cap D_{f_i} \neq \emptyset \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad T' = D_{f'} \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I'} D_{f_i}$$

and define similarly I''' and T''' . We set:

$$(i) \quad g'_f = \frac{1}{m_{q-1}} \left(\sum_{i \in I'} g_{f_i} + \sum_{k \in K'} e_{l_k}^* \right).$$

It is obvious that $g'_f \in K_{q-1}$. Moreover, for $k \leq t-1$ we get:

If $k \in \cup_{i \in I'} D_{f_i}$, then $|f'(y'_k)| \leq 4g_f(e_{l_k})$ by the inductive assumption.

If $k \in T'$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |f'(y'_k)| &= \frac{1}{m_q} \left| \left(\sum f_i \right) (y'_k) \right| \leq \frac{1}{m_q} \|y_k\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{m_{2j_t}}{m_{2j_t-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{m_q} \leq \frac{m_q}{m_{q-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{m_q} = \frac{1}{m_{q-1}} = g'_t(e_{l_k}). \end{aligned}$$

$$(ii) \quad g''_f = |f(y_t)| \cdot e_{l_t}^*.$$

$$(iii) \quad g'''_f = \frac{1}{m_{q-1}} \left(\sum_{i \in I'''} g_{f_i} + \sum_{k \in K'''} e_{l_k}^* \right).$$

Then $g'''_f \in K_{q-1}$. For $k \in \cup_{i \in I'''} D_{f_i}$, $|f'''(y'_k)| \leq 4g_f(e_{l_k})$ by the inductive assumption. For $k \in T'''$ we get

$$|f'''(y'_k)| = \frac{1}{m_q} \left| \sum (f_i)(y'_k) \right| \leq \frac{4}{m_q} \leq \frac{1}{m_{q-1}} = g'''_f(e_{l_k}),$$

using Corollary 2.11. Finally, we set

$$g_f = \frac{1}{2} (g'_f + g''_f + g'''_f).$$

This completes the proof for ψ' .

The construction of ψ'' is similar.

Finally, $\psi = \frac{1}{2}(\psi' + \psi'')$.

2.14 Proposition. Let $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k$ be a $\left(\frac{1}{m_j^4}, j\right)$ -rapidly increasing s.c.c. Then for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, ϕ in K_i , we have the following estimates:

- (a) $|\phi(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k)| \leq \frac{16}{m_i m_j}$, if $i < j$,
- (b) $|\phi(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k)| \leq \frac{8}{m_i}$, if $j \leq i < 2j_1$ or $2j_n < i$,
- (c) $|\phi(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k)| \leq \frac{4}{m_{i-1}} + 4|a_{k_0}| |\phi(y_{k_0})|$, if $2j_{k_0} \leq i < 2j_{k_0+1}$.

Proof. It follows easily from Proposition 2.5 and Lemma 2.13.

2.15 Corollary. If $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k$ is a $\left(\frac{1}{m_j^4}, j\right)$ -rapidly increasing s.c.c. then

$$\frac{1}{4m_j} \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k \right\| \leq \frac{8}{m_j}.$$

2.16 Corollary. X_u is arbitrarily distortable.

Proof. Choose i_0 arbitrarily large. Let

$$\|x\| = \frac{1}{m_{i_0}} \|x\| + \sup \{ \phi(x) : \phi \in K_{i_0} \}.$$

Let Y be a block subspace of X_u . Let $j > i_0$. Using Lemma 2.9, we can choose the following vectors in Y ,

$$\begin{aligned} y &= \sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k, \text{ a } \left(\frac{1}{m_j^4}, j\right)\text{-rapidly increasing s.c.c.} \\ z &= \sum_{l=1}^m b_l z_l, \text{ a } \left(\frac{1}{m_{i_0}^4}, i_0\right)\text{-rapidly increasing s.c.c.} \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Corollary 2.14,

$$\|m_j y\| \leq \frac{8}{m_{i_0}} + \frac{16}{m_{i_0}} = \frac{24}{m_{i_0}} \text{ while } \|m_j y\| \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

$$\|m_{i_0} z\| \geq \frac{1}{4} \text{ while } \|m_{i_0} z\| \leq 8.$$

This completes the proof.

3 The space X

We turn now to defining the Banach space X not containing any unconditional basic sequence. The norm of the space is related to that of X_u introduced in the previous section. Specifically, the norm will be defined by a family $\{L_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ of subsets of c_{00} such that each L_j is contained in the set K_j used in the definition of X_u . We consider the countable set

$$G = \left\{ (x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_k^*) : x_i^* \in \bigcup_{j=0}^\infty K_j, x_1^* < x_2^* < \dots < x_k^* \right\}.$$

There exists a function $\Phi : G \longrightarrow \{2j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ one to one such that if $(x_1^*, \dots, x_k^*) \in G$, $x_1^* \in K_{j_1}, \dots, x_k^* \in K_{j_k}$, then

$$\Phi((x_1^*, \dots, x_k^*)) > \max\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}.$$

For $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ we define by induction sets $\{L_j^n\}_{j=0}^\infty$ such that L_j^n is a subset of K_j^n and $\{L_j^n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is an increasing family. We set $L_j^0 = \{\pm e_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$. Suppose that $\{L_j^n\}_{j=0}^\infty$ have been defined and set

$$L_{2j}^{n+1} = \pm L_{2j}^n \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{m_{2j}} (x_1^* + \dots + x_d^*) : x_i \in \bigcup_{j=0}^\infty L_j^n, (\text{supp } x_1^*, \dots, \text{supp } x_d^*) \right. \\ \left. \text{is } \mathcal{M}_{2j} \text{-admissible} \right\},$$

$$L_{2j+1}^{n+1} = \pm L_{2j+1}^n \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} (x_1^* + \dots + x_d^*) : x_1^* \in L_{2k}^n, k > 2j+1, \right. \\ \left. x_i^* \in L_{\Phi(x_1^*, \dots, x_{i-1}^*)}^n \text{ for } 1 < i \leq d \text{ and } (\text{supp } x_1^*, \dots, \text{supp } x_d^*) \right\}$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{is } \mathcal{M}_{2j+1}\text{-admissible} \end{array} \right\} \text{ and}$$

$$L_{2j+1}^{n+1} = \left\{ E_s x^* : x^* \in L_{2j+1}^{n+1}, s \in \mathbf{N}, E_s = \{s, s+1, \dots\} \right\}$$

This completes the definition of L_j^n , $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. It is obvious that each L_j^n is a subset of the corresponding set K_j^n .

We set $L_j = \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} L_j^n$ and we consider the norm on c_{00} defined by the family $L = \cup_{j=0}^{\infty} L_j$. The space X is the completion of c_{00} under this norm. It is easy to see that $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a bimonotone basis of X .

3.1 Remark. An alternative implicit definition of the norm of the space X is the following. For $x \in c_{00}$,

$$\|x\| = \max \left\{ \|x\|_0, \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{m_{2j}} \sum_{k=1}^n \|E_k x\|, j \in \mathbf{N}, n \in \mathbf{N}, \{E_1 < \dots < E_n\} \text{ is } \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \mathcal{M}_{2j}\text{-admissible} \right\}, \sup \left\{ |\phi(x)| : \phi \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} L^{2j+1} \right\} \right\}.$$

Hence, for $j = 1, 2, \dots$ and for $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n$ in c_{00} such that $\{\text{supp } x_1, \text{supp } x_2, \dots, \text{supp } x_n\}$ is $\mathcal{M}_{2j}$ -admissible, we have that $\|\sum_{k=1}^n x_k\| \geq \frac{1}{m_{2j}} \sum_{k=1}^n \|x_k\|$. This allows us to have the following result in the same manner as Lemma 2.9.

3.2 Lemma. For $j = 1, 2, \dots$ and every normalized block sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ in X there exists $\{y_s\}_{s=1}^n$ a finite block sequence of $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\sum_{s=1}^n a_s y_s$ is a normalized $\left(\frac{1}{m_j^3}, 2j\right)$ -s.c.c.

3.3 Proposition. Let $\sum a_k x_k$ be an $\left(\frac{1}{m_j^3}, j\right)$ -s.c.c. defined by an $\left(\frac{1}{m_j^3}, j\right)$ -basic s.c.c. $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k e_{l_k}$. Then for every $s \leq j$ and ϕ in L_s there exists ψ in K_s such that

$$\phi \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k \right) \leq 2\psi \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k m_j e_{l_k} \right).$$

The proof of this is similar to the proof of Proposition 2.10.

3.4 Proposition. Let $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k$ be a $\left(\frac{1}{m^4 j}, j\right)$ -rapidly increasing s.c.c. in X . Then for $i = I$, $\phi \in L_i$, we have the following estimates:

- (a) $|\phi(\sum_{n=1}^k a_k y_k)| \leq \frac{16}{m_i m_j}$ if $i < j$,
- (b) $|\phi(\sum_{n=1}^k a_k y_k)| \leq \frac{8}{m_i}$ if $j \leq i < 2j_1$ or if $i > 2j_n$,
- (c) $|\phi(\sum_{n=1}^k a_k y_k)| \leq \frac{4}{m_{i-1}} + 4|a_{k_0}||\phi(y_{k_0})|$ if $2j_{k_0} \leq i < 2j_{k_0+1}$.

In particular, $\|\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k\| \leq \frac{8}{m_j}$.

This is proved similarly to Proposition 2.14.

3.5 Lemma. Let $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k$ be an (ϵ, j) -s.c.c. and $2i < j$. Then for every ψ in K_i , $\psi = \frac{1}{m_{2i}}(x_1^* + \dots + x_d^*)$ and every choice $\{a_{k_t}\}_{t=1}^s$ such that for every $t = 1, \dots, s$ there exist $\tau_1 < \tau_2 \leq d$ so that $x_{\tau_1}^*(x_{k_t}) \neq 0$ and $x_{\tau_2}^*(x_{k_{t+1}}) \neq 0$, we have $\sum_{t=1}^s a_{k_t} < m_{2i} \cdot \epsilon$.

Proof. Let $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k e_{l_k}$ be the (ϵ, j) -basic s.c.c. that defines the vector $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k$. It is easy to check that the set $(e_{l_{k_t}})_{t=1}^s$ is $\mathcal{M}_{2i}$ -admissible, hence

$$\frac{1}{m_{2i}} \sum_{t=1}^s a_{k_t} \leq \left\| \sum_{t=1}^s a_{k_t} e_{l_{k_t}} \right\|_{2i} < \epsilon$$

and the proof is complete.

3.6 Proposition. Let $j > 100$ and $\{j_1, \dots, j_n\}$ be such that $2j + 1 < j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_n$ in $\mathbf{N}$. Suppose that $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^n, \{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^n$ are such that:

- (i) Each y_k is a $\left(\frac{1}{m_{2j_k}^4}, 2j_k\right)$ -rapidly increasing s.c.c.
- (ii) $y_k^* \in L_{2j_k}$, $y_k^*(y_k) \geq \frac{1}{2m_{2j_k}}$, $y_{k_1}^*(y_{k_2}) = 0$ for $k_1 \neq k_2$, $y_1^* < y_2^* < \dots < y_n^*$.
- (iii) $\frac{1}{8} \leq \theta_k \leq 2$ and $y_k^*(m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k) = 1$.
- (iv) $2j_k = \Phi(y_1^*, \dots, y_{k-1}^*)$, $k = 2, \dots, n$.
- (v) There exists decreasing sequence $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k y_k$ is $\left(\frac{1}{m_{2j+2}^4}, 2j+1\right)$ -s.c.c.

Let $(\epsilon_k)_{k=1}^n$ be such that $\epsilon_k = 1$ if k is even and $\epsilon_k = -1$ if k is odd. It is clear that

$$\left| \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k^*(y_k) \right| \leq a_{k_1} \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+2}^4}.$$

Then $\| \sum \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} y_k \| \leq \frac{18}{m_{2j+2}}.$

The proof is given in several steps. Our aim is to show that for every $\phi \in \cup_{j=0}^{\infty} L_j$,

$$\phi \left(\sum \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k \right) \leq \frac{18}{m_{2j+2}}.$$

3.7 Lemma. Let y be a $\left(\frac{1}{m_{2j}^4}, 2j\right)$ -rapidly increasing s.c.c. and $z_1^*, \dots, z_d^*$ be in $L_{2j_1}, \dots, L_{2j_d}$, respectively, such that $2j_k \neq 2j$ for all $k = 1, \dots, d$ and $(\text{supp } z_1, \dots, \text{supp } z_d)$ is $\mathcal{M}_i$ -admissible for some $i < \min\{2j, 2j_1, \dots, 2j_d\}$. Then

$$|z_1^* + \dots + z_d^*(y)| < \sum_{k=1}^{d_1} \frac{16}{m_{2j_k} m_{2j}} + \sum_{k=d_1+1}^d \frac{8}{m_{2j_k-1}} + \frac{1}{m_{2j}^2},$$

where $j_1 < \dots < j_{d_1} < j < j_{d_1+1} < \dots < j_d$.

Proof. Let $y = \sum_{n=1}^l a_n x_n$ be the expression of y as a rapidly increasing $\left(\frac{1}{m_{2j}^4}, 2j\right)$ -s.c.c. First we notice that for $1 \leq k < d_1$, $|z_k^*(y)| \leq \frac{16}{m_{2j_k} m_{2j}}$ and for every $d_1 + 1 \leq k \leq d$, $|z_k^*(y)| \leq \frac{4}{m_{2j_k-1}} + 4a_{n_k} |z_k^*(x_{n_k})|$.

For $n = 1, 2, \dots, l$ we set $I_n = \{k : n_k = n\}$. Then $|\sum_{k \in I_{n_0}} z_k^*(y)| \leq \sum_{k \in I_{n_0}} \frac{4}{m_{2j_k-1}} + 64a_{n_0}$ since $|\sum_{n \in I_{n_0}} z_k^*(y)| \leq 16$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=d_1+1}^d z_k^*(y) \right| &\leq \sum_{n=1}^l \left| \sum_{k \in I_n} z_k^*(y) \right| + \left| \sum_{k \notin \cup_{n=1}^l I_n} z_k^*(y) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=d_1+1}^d \frac{4}{m_{2j-1}} + 64 \sum_{k \in S} a_{n_k}, \end{aligned}$$

where $S \subset \{d_1 + 1, \dots, d\}$ is such that for $k_1 \neq k_2$ in S , $n_{k_1} \neq n_{k_2}$ and S is maximal with this property. Observe that $\{\text{supp } x_{n_k}\}_{k \in S}$ is $\mathcal{M}_i$ -admissible. Hence, by Lemma 3.5, we get that $16 \sum_{k \in S} a_{n_k} < 16m_i \cdot \frac{1}{m_{2j}^4} \leq \frac{1}{m_{2j}^2}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

3.8 Proposition. Let y_k be a $\left(\frac{1}{m_{2j_k}^4}, 2j_k\right)$ -rapidly increasing s.c.c. for $k = 1, \dots, n$ and z_s^* be in L_{2t_s} for $s = 1, \dots, d$. Suppose that $2j+1 < j_1 < \dots < j_n$, $2j+1 < t_1 < \dots < t_d$, $\{j_1, \dots, j_n\} \cap \{t_1, \dots, t_d\} = \emptyset$ and $(\text{supp } z_1^*, \dots, \text{supp } z_d^*)$ is $\mathcal{M}_{2j+1}$ -admissible.

Then $\left(\sum_{s=1}^d z_s^*\right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k m_{2j_k} y_k\right) < \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k| \frac{1}{m_{2j+2}^2}$.

Proof. It follows easily from Lemma 3.7.

3.9 Proposition. For every ϕ in L_{2j+1} we have

$$\phi \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k \right) \leq \frac{4}{m_{2j+2}^2}.$$

Proof. Let $\phi = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}(x_{k_1-1}^* + y_{k_1}^* \dots + y_{k_2}^* + z_{k_2+1}^* + \dots + z_d^*)$ be in L_{2j+1} . Set $w = \sum_{k=1}^n \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(w)| &\leq \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}} |(y_{k_1}^* + \dots + y_{k_2}^*)(w)| + |x_{k_1-1}^*(w)| + |(z_{k_2+2}^* + \dots + z_d^*)(w)| \\ &< a_{k_1} + a_{k_1-1} + \frac{1}{m_{2j+2}^2} + \frac{2}{m_{2j+2}^2} < \frac{4}{m_{2j+2}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

3.10 Proposition. If $i > 2j+1$ and ϕ is in L_i , we have the following

$$\phi \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k m_{2j_k} y_k \right) \leq \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k| \frac{16}{m_i} & \text{if } 2j+1 < i < 2j_1 \text{ or } i > 2j_n \\ 4 \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{|a_k|}{m_{i-2}} + 8|a_{k_0}| & \text{if } 2j_{k_0} \leq i < 2j_{k_0+1} \end{cases}.$$

Proof The case $2j+1 < i < 2j_1$ follows from Proposition 3.4 (a), the case $2j_{k_0} \leq i \leq 2j_{k_0+1}$ and $i > 2j_n$ from Proposition 3.4 (b) and (c) and the fact that for $i_1 < i_2$, $\frac{m_{i_1}}{m_{i_2}} < \frac{1}{m_{i_2-1}}$.

3.11 Lemma. For every $i < 2j+1$ and ϕ in L_i we have

$$\phi \left(\sum \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k \right) \leq \frac{18}{m_{2j+2}}.$$

Proof. Let $\{K^s(\phi)\}_{s=0}^m$ be an analysis of the functional ϕ . We set

$$W = \left\{ k : \exists s > s_k \text{ and } f^k \in K^s(\phi) \text{ such that } f = \frac{1}{2^{j+1}} \left(x_{t_1-1}^* + y_{t_1}^* + \cdots + y_{t_2}^* + z_{t_2+1}^* + \cdots + z_d^* \right) \text{ and } t_1 \leq k \leq t_2 \right\}.$$

For every k in W we denote by f^k the function f which witnesses the belongingness of k in W and is such that if f^k is in $K^s(\phi)$, s is the maximum level where such an f occurs. We also denote by t_1^k, t_2^k the corresponding t_1, t_2 of the function f^k . Observe that the family $\{[t_1^k, t_2^k]_{k \in W}\}$ defines a partition of the set W . Therefore we write the above segments as $\{T_\sigma\}_{\sigma=1}^w$.

We set

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \left\{ k : k \in W^c \text{ and for every } f \in \bigcup_{s=0}^m K^s(\phi) \text{ with} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{supp } \phi \cap \text{supp } y_k = \text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } y_k \neq \emptyset \text{ we have } f \in \bigcup_{i' \leq 2j} L_{i'} \right\} \\ S_2 &= \left\{ k : k \in W \text{ for every } f \text{ strictly extending } f^k, f \text{ is in } \bigcup_{i' \leq 2j} L_{i'} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We set $I_1 = S_1 \cup S_2$.

CLAIM 1: There exists ψ with $\|\psi\|_{2j}^* \leq 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \phi \left(\sum_{k \in I_1} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k \right) \right| &\leq \psi \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} a_k e_{l_k} + 2 \sum_{\sigma=1}^w a_{k_\sigma} a_{k_\sigma} e_{l_{k_\sigma}} \right) \\ &\leq 64 \|a_k e_{l_k}\|_{2j} < \frac{1}{m_{2j+2}^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{k_\sigma} = \max\{a_k : k \in T_\sigma\}$.

Proof of the claim. We follow the same procedure as in the proof of Proposition 2.10. For f in $K^s(\phi)$ we construct by induction a functional g_f with $\|g_f\|_{2j}^* \leq 1$ and such that

If $D_f = \{k : k \in S_1, s > s_k\} \cup \{k_\sigma : f \text{ extends } f^{k_\sigma}\}$.

Then

- 1) $g_f = 0$ if $D_f = \emptyset$
- 2) $\text{supp } g_f \subset \{l_k : k \in D_f\}$

3) $|f(a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y'_k)| \leq 16g_f(a_k e_{l_k})$ for $k \in S_1 \cap D_f$ (y'_k is the inital part of y_k),

$$|f(\sum_{k \in T_\sigma} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)| \leq 2g_f(a_{k_\sigma} e_{l_{k_\sigma}}) \text{ if } k_\sigma \in D_f, k = k_\sigma.$$

Suppose that g_f has been constructed for f in $K^{s'}(\phi)$ for all $s' < s$. Choose f in $K^s(\phi) \setminus K^{s'}(\phi)$ with $D_f \neq \emptyset$. Then either $i' \leq 2j$ or $i' = 2j + 1$.

If $i' \leq 2j$, we observe that $D_f = \cup_{t=1}^d D_{f_t} \cup (D_f \cap S_1)$, where $f = \frac{1}{m_{i'}}(f_1 + \dots + f_d)$ and $g_f = \frac{1}{m_{i'}}(\sum_{t \in I} g_{f_t} + \sum_{k \in T} e_{l_k}^*)$ with I and T are as in Proposition 2.10. Therefore we conclude (as in Proposition 2.10) that $\|g_f\|_{2j}^* \leq 1$. Now using the fact that $i' \leq 2j < 2j_k$ we conclude that for $k \in T$ we get the inductive condition (3) for the function g_f .

If $i = 2j + 1$ then $f = f^{k_\sigma}$, hence $D_f = \{k_\sigma\}$. Set $g_f = e_{l_{k_\sigma}}^*$ and $|f(\sum_{k \in T_\sigma} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)| = |f \sum_{k \in T_\sigma} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} y_k^* \theta_k(y_k)| \leq a_{k_\sigma}$.

The same proof works for the final parts $\{y''_k\}_{k \in S_1}$ and the proof of Claim 1 is complete.

We set

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \left\{ k \notin W \cup I_1 \text{ and there exists } s > s_k, f \text{ in } K^s(\phi), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } y_k = \text{supp } \phi \cap \text{supp } y_k \text{ such that } |f(m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)| \leq \frac{16}{m_{2j+2}} \right\}. \\ I_3 &= \left\{ k \in W : \text{there exists } f \in \cup_{s=1}^m K^s(\phi), f \text{ strictly extending } f^k \text{ and} \right. \\ &\quad \left. f \in L_i \text{ for some } i \geq 2j + 1 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that $|f(\sum_{k \in I_2} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)| < \sum_{k \in I_2} \frac{2|a_k|}{m_{2j+2}}$.

Suppose now that $k \in I_3$ and $i = 2j + 1$. Then $f = \frac{1}{m_{2j+1}}(f_1 + \dots + f_d)$ and there exists f_t with f_t extending f^{k_σ} and f_t in L_{2s_t} for some $s_t > 2j + 1$. Hence for $k \in T_\sigma$,

$$|f(a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)| < \frac{|f^{k_\sigma}(a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)|}{m_{2s_t}} < \frac{2|a_k|}{m_{2j+2}}.$$

Similarly, if f extends f^{k_σ} and f is in L_i for $i \geq 2j + 2$, we get that for $k \in T_\sigma$,

$$|f(a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)| \leq \frac{|f^{k_\sigma}(a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)|}{m_i} \leq \frac{|a_k|}{m_{2j+2}}.$$

Hence

$$\phi \left(\sum_{k \in I_3} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} y_k \right) \leq \frac{\sum_{k \in I_3} |a_k|}{m_{2j+2}}.$$

Notice that $W \subset I_1 \cup I_3$. We set $I_4 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3$.

It remains to estimate the quantity $\phi \left(\sum_{k \in I_4} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k \right)$. To this end, we first make the following observations.

- (i) If $k_0 \in I_4$, there exists $f \in \cup_{s > s_k} K_s(\phi)$ such that
 $\text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } y_{k_0} = \text{supp } \phi \cap \text{supp } y_{k_0}$ $f \in L_{i'}$ with $2j_{k_0} \leq i' < 2j_{k_0+1}$
and
 $|f_{i'}(\sum \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k)| \leq 4 \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{|a_k|}{m_{i'-2}} + 4|a_{k_0}|$ (Proposition 3.10).
Otherwise k is in $I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3$.
- (ii) If $k \in I_4$ and f is as above, then for every $s' > s$, $f' \in F_{s'}(\phi)$ such that
 $\text{supp } f \subset \text{supp } f'$ we have $f' \in \cup_{i' \leq 2j} L_{i'}$. Otherwise k is in I_2 .
- (iii) If k_1, k_2 are in I_4 , $k_1 \neq k_2$ and $f \in K^s(\phi)$ is such that $s > \max\{s_{k_1}, s_{k_2}\}$,
 $f \in L_{i'}$ for $i' \geq 2j+1$ and $f(y_{k_1}) \neq 0$, then $f(y_{k_2}) = 0$. This happens
since any such f is pathological on only one y_k , therefore, if f is different
than zero on both, then at least one does not belong to I_4 .

After this we prove the following

$$\text{CLAIM 2: } \left| \phi \left(\sum_{k \in I_4} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k \right) \right| \leq 16 \left\| \sum_{k \in I_3} a_k e_{l_k} \right\|_{2j}.$$

Proof: For $f \in K_s(\phi)$ we define, as in Claim 1, the set D_f and inductively a functional g_f in $\cup_{i' \leq 2j} K_{i'}$. If f is in $K_s(\phi)$ and $f \in L_{i'}$ for some $i' \leq 2j$ then we define g_f as in Claim 1. If $i' \geq 2j+1$ then either $D_f = \emptyset$ or $D_f = \{k\}$. This follows immediately from property (iii) of I_4 mentioned above. Therefore, setting $g_f = \frac{1}{m_{i'}} e_k^*$, we easily check that the inductive assumptions are satisfied. The proof of the claim is complete.

$$\text{Hence } \left| \phi \left(\sum_{k \in I_4} \epsilon_k a_k m_{2j_k} \theta_k y_k \right) \right| < \frac{1}{m_{2j+2}^2}$$

The proof is complete.

3.12 Proposition. Let $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$, $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$ be two normalized block sequences in the space X . Then there exist $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^d$, $\{y_n^*\}_{n=1}^d$, $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^d$, $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^d$, satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 3.6 and such that for n odd y_n is a block of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$ while for n even y_n is a block of $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$.

Proof. Let j be given. We choose inductively a sequence $\{n_l\}_{l=1}^\infty \subset \mathbf{N}$ and vectors $u_{l,A}, v_{l,A} \in X$, $u_{l,A}^*, v_{l,A}^* \in X^*$, $l = 1, 2, \dots$, $A \subset \{1, \dots, l-1\}$ such that

- (a) each $u_{l,A}$ is a block vector of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$ and each $v_{l,A}$ is a block vector of $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$
- (b) For every $l = 1, 2, \dots$ and every $A \subset \{1, \dots, l-1\}$ the vectors $u_{l,A}, u_{l,A}^*, v_{l,A}, v_{l,A}^*$ are supported inside $(n_{l-1}, n_l]$.
- (c) Each $u_{l,A}$ is a $\left(\frac{1}{m_{2s}^4}, 2s\right)$ -rapidly increasing s.c.c., $u_{l,A}^* \in L_{2s}$ and $u_{l,A}^* \geq \frac{1}{4m_{2s}}$ where $2s > 2j + 1$ if $A = \emptyset$ and $2s = \phi(u_{l_1, \emptyset}^*, u_{l_2, A_1}^*, \dots, u_{l_k, A_{k-1}}^*)$ if $A = \{l_1 < \dots < l_k\}$ and $A_i = \{l_1, \dots, l_i\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$.

The analogous relations hold for $v_{l,A}, v_{l,A}^*$.

The inductive construction is straightforward.

Choose $F \subset \{n_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$, $F = \{n_{l_1}, \dots, n_{l_k}\}$ such that a convex combination $\sum_{n_l \in F} a_l e_{n_l}$ is a $\left(\frac{1}{m_{2j+2}^2}, 2j+1\right)$ -basic s.c.c.

For $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, set $A_i = \{l_1, \dots, l_i\}$. Then it is easy to check that the sequence

$$u_{l_1, \emptyset}, v_{l_2, A_1}, \dots, v_{l_k, A_{k-1}}$$

and the corresponding one in X^* have the desired properties.

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of the previous proposition.

3.13 Corollary. The Banach space X is Hereditarily Indecomposable and hence it does not contain any unconditional basic sequence.

REFERENCES

- [Al-Ar] D. E. ALSPACH and S. ARGYROS, *Complexity of weakly null sequences*, Dissertationes Mathematicae, 321, 1992.

- [Ar-D] S. ARGYROS and I. DELIYANNI, *Banach spaces of the type of Tsirelson*, preprint, 1992.
- [B] S. F. BELLENOT, *Tsirelson superspaces and ℓ_p* , Journal of Funct. Analysis, 69, No 2, 1986, 207-228.
- [C-S] P. G. CASAZZA and T. SHURA, *Tsirelson's space*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1363, Springer Verlag, 1989.
- [F-J] T. FIGIEL and W. B. JOHNSON, *A uniformly convex Banach space which contains no ℓ_p* , Compositio Math. 29, 1974, 179-190.
- [G1] W. T. GOWERS, *A Banach space not containing ℓ_1 or c_0 or a reflexive subspace*, (preprint).
- [G2] W. T. GOWERS, *A hereditarily indecomposable space with an asymptotically unconditional basis* (preprint).
- [G3] W. T. GOWERS, *A new dichotomy for Banach spaces* (preprint).
- [G-M] W. T. GOWERS and B. MAUREY, *The unconditional basic sequence problem*, Journal of AMS 6, 1993, 851-874.
- [Ma] B. MAUREY, *A remark about distortion*, (preprint).
- [Ma-Mi-To] M. MAUREY, V. D. MILMAN and N. TOMCZAK-JAEGERMANN, *Asymptotic infinite dimensional theory of Banach spaces*, (preprint).
- [Ma-R] B. MAUREY and H. ROSENTHAL, *Normalized weakly null sequences with no unconditional subsequence*, Studia Math. 61, 1977, 77-98.
- [Mi-To] V. D. MILMAN and N. TOMCZAK-JAEGERMANN, *Asymptotic ℓ_p spaces and bounded distortions*, Banach spaces, Contemp. Math. 144, 1993, 173-196.
- [O-Schl] E. ODELL and T. SCHLUMPRECHT, *The distortion problem*, (preprint)
- [Schl] T. SCHLUMPRECHT, *An arbitrarily distortable Banach space*, Israel J. Math. 76, 1991, 81-95.
- [Schr] J. SCHREIER, *Ein Gegenbeispiel zur Theorie der schwachen Konvergenz*, Studia Math. 2, 1930, 58-62.
- [T] B. S. TSIRELSON, *Not every Banach space contains ℓ_p or c_0* , Funct. Anal. Appl. 8 (1974), p. 138-141.

e-mail: sargyros@atlas.uoa.ariadne-t.gr
deligia@talos.cc.uch.gr